

# The Presbyterian Guardian

November, 1938

VOLUME 5, NO. 11

J. Gresham Machen  
Editor 1936-1937

One Dollar a Year

#### EDITORIAL COUNCIL

1505 Race Street,  
Philadelphia, Penna.

Edwin H. Rian  
Leslie W. Sloat

Ned B. Stonehouse  
Murray Forst Thompson

Thomas R. Birch  
Managing Editor

## The Princeton That Was

By the REV. JOHN MACLEOD, D.D.

Principal of the Free Church College, Edinburgh, Scotland

**T**HE name of Princeton Theology is associated in the Reformed churches all the world over with the seminary in which Hodge and Warfield taught. But before that institution was founded, what is now Princeton University was, in its earlier days, a school in which the orthodox Calvinistic faith found a home. In Colonial days it was known in the old world as the place associated with the names of Dickinson and Davies, where the great Edwards died and John Witherspoon taught. In those days, the believing evangelical character of its message and teaching was not in doubt.

With this earlier tradition that preceded its founding, the record of the seminary was in full harmony when, under the hands of Archibald Alexander, Samuel Miller, and even more of their eminent pupil, Charles Hodge, it took the foremost place in the defense and exposition of the Reformed Faith. Such was the place that it came to hold that the pure strain of historic Calvinism came to be spoken of as Princeton Theology. A century ago, when the Presbyterian Church was rent in two, Princeton stood by the Old School body whose witness to the system of the Reformed Faith, or to pure Calvinism, was beyond suspicion. The infiltration of a modified Calvinism from New England sources precipitated the division of 1837. "The Gentlemen of Princeton," as the conductors of the *Princeton Review*

were called, did not favor a policy that would, of set purpose, break the unity of the fellowship of the church, for by its avowed profession it was bound to the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Confession. They did not, however, come under the suspicion of teaching anything else than the genuine doctrine of that Confession, and when the break took place there was no question as to where they stood. It is not even a travesty of the truth, it is a sheer trifling with it, to suggest or to insinuate, as has been done in recent years, that the original teaching staff of the seminary was so moderate that it would throw the mantle of its charity over anything that was inconsistent with an intelligent and unmistakable avowal of the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and the entire truth of the witness of the Gospels to the spotless Incarnation of the Son of God.

The utmost that could be said in regard to the comprehensiveness of doctrinal fellowship of the Princeton leaders was that they regarded as coming within the ambit of historic Calvinism the New Methodism of the mediating school of French Huguenots in the 17th century. This, in substance, was what was reproduced in the teaching of the New School men of their day. These had their quarrel in particular with the doctrine of Imputation, and the magnificent defense of standard

Calvinism which Hodge wrote in the *Review*, and which was reissued in the first series of Princeton Essays, is one of the monumental things that tell of the clarity of his mind and his theological insight. None, however, of even the New School men of a century ago, though their teaching helped to break the church, would have dreamed of going to such a length as the Auburn Affirmation. It would be a slander on their memory to suggest that they could extend the hospitality of the Christian pulpit to doctrine that was so flagrantly opposed to the historic teaching of believing Christendom.

What Princeton stood for in its interpretation of the system of the Reformed Faith is put down in black and white in his article dealing with this matter which was contributed by Charles Hodge to the *Princeton Review* in 1867 on the very eve of the reunion of the Old and New School bodies. It was the judgment of the man more entitled than any of his age to set forth with authority the mind of that church and school of which he had been so long the most distinguished ornament. The idea that rationalistic and unbelieving opposition could be reconciled to the system of doctrine set forth in Holy Scripture did not enter into the wildest thoughts of English-speaking evangelicals in those days.

There was a conundrum that asked, "What is Princeton?" The answer was, "An everlasting inheritance for the Alexanders and the Hodges." Such was the close relation in which those honored families stood to the maintenance, exposition, and defense of the Reformed Faith. The last of the Hodge family at Princeton is gone; and it would give a measure of relief in thinking of Dr. Caspar's passing if one could be sure that he was not under notice to quit. His time, however, had come. His father and his uncle and his grandfather had adorned the institution in which he was the third of his race to hold the Chair of Dogmatics. And in his own department, one would search far to find the like of him in the Reformed churches, so well informed, so balanced, and so sound in the faith. Outside the Westminster circle, Westminster had few warmer friends than

Caspar Hodge. He knew what it stood for, and he wished it well. He did not, it is true, take the line that his intimate friends took at the crisis, when they thought the time had come for preserving the tradition of the Princeton That Was by founding a loyal successor. He held the view that the revolutionary change in the management of the seminary should be challenged in the law courts on the score of its incompetency. They all saw the gravity of the issue that had to be faced, and that the continuity of the Princeton tradition was at stake.

But what was it that the Princeton That Was stood for? It stood for the unambiguous maintenance and avowal of the truth of historic Christianity as a pervasively supernatural revelation and message. It stood four-square on the subject of the trustworthiness of the apostolic deposit. It accepted the historic canon of the New Testament, and it was content to learn its doctrine of the nature and inspiration of Scripture from the teaching and the claims of the Apostles themselves. This meant that it believed, in regard to the full canon of Scripture, what the Christian ages have held: that the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God. This underlay the whole contentings of the Reformers and the theology which they taught and which goes by their name. That theology would be left without a norm or a principium if the whole foundation on which it built was to be sapped and undermined.

If there was one man more than another in the last generation who had a grip of the situation in the theological world, it was Dr. B. B. Warfield. He bent all his energies to uphold the integrity of the faith. In regard to his own church, he did what a man could to prevent the union of the Northern Church with the Cumberland Arminians. He held that it was a thing unworthy of his church that the promoters of this union had in view when they would, for the united body, retain the old pledge though, with their eyes open, they were working for the admission to their ecclesiastical fellowship of men who did not hold the system of doctrine taught in the Scripture and set forth in the Westminster Confession. It was beyond doubt that the Cumber-

land brethren, unless they renounced their Arminianism, could not as honest men pledge themselves to the system of the Reformed churches which their fathers had set aside. In his endeavor to counter this shady bit of church policy, Dr. Warfield tried to heal another breach that presented elements of hope if only he could succeed. But the brethren of the Church in the South were not prepared to reciprocate his overtures of approach.

Not only in the teaching from his chair, but also by the influence which he exercised through the press, he fought a steady fight for what he saw to be in peril—the maintenance in the church of the historic Christian Faith. He wielded his pen in *The Presbyterian Review* in which his earlier work appeared, in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* in whose conduct and policy he was the leading spirit, and in *The Princeton Theological Review* which he and his fellows conducted down to the end. And in the work that he did, and directed, and inspired, it was his aim to prepare the church for the day that was coming upon her. He sought to instruct the ministry in the knowledge of the issues at stake in current questions as these bore on the maintenance primarily of a supernatural Christianity, and in connection therewith of what he held to be the purest expression of the historic Christian Faith which he found to be in Calvinism or the confessions of the Reformed churches. There was no misunderstanding what the Princeton of his day stood for. It had still retained its integrity, and the succession of its tradition was guaranteed by the conservative constitution of the Board of Directors. It was this guarantee of continuance and stability that was deliberately sacrificed by the changes of ten years ago.

There was no question as to what Robert Dick Wilson stood for. There was none as to what J. Gresham Machen stood for. The writer of these lines, a mere bird of passage in America, had the honor of enjoying the friendship of all these—Warfield, Wilson and Machen. When Warfield died, the battle in the pages of *The Princeton Theological Review* was kept up by the other two and their

(Please Turn to Page 210)

# Choose Ye This Day!

An Analysis of the Reasons Why Christians  
Should Separate From the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

By the REV. JOHN P. GALBRAITH

Pastor of the Gethsemane Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Penna.



Mr. Galbraith

THE Protestant Church today owes its existence, in large part and humanly speaking, to the fact that in the early part of the 16th century a Roman Catholic monk was teaching in the University of Wittenberg, Germany. His name was Martin Luther. During his study in preparation for teaching a course in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, his eyes were gradually opened to the marvellous doctrines of salvation by grace taught in that book. So he began to teach them in his classes. He was thus immediately brought into conflict with many common doctrines and practices of his church. Therefore he was forced to assail those things which were to him so plainly contrary to God's Word. He attacked the doctrine and practice of indulgences—that money paid to the church can warrant the remission of the penalty of sins. He combated the idea of a "treasury of merit"—that there is merit available to be distributed by the church to needy sinners. Such things are wholly contrary to salvation by grace. And in God's providence that was brought to Martin Luther's eyes.

His classroom attacks, however, were only the beginning. For on October 31, 1517, he nailed to the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg a list of subjects on which he differed with the Roman Catholic Church, and offered to prove that he derived his beliefs from the Bible. From that time on this noble soldier of the faith encountered one difficulty and trial after another, until finally, in 1520, the Pope issued a bull forbidding anyone to follow Luther's teaching. The writings of the monk were ordered to be burned, and Luther was directed to retract his teachings within 60 days or to suffer arrest and be sent to Rome for punishment as a heretic. When a copy of the bull at

last reached Luther on October 12th of that year, he had a great bonfire built for the occasion, and into the midst of the inferno he cast the papal mandate, thus signifying, "I must obey God rather than men!" Luther thus definitely broke with the Roman Catholic Church and renounced its jurisdiction.

## An Historic Parallel

Four hundred and sixteen years later Martin Luther's departure from the Romish Church had its exact parallel in the exodus of certain members from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Being an exact parallel, it inexorably follows that if Luther was right, we who have left the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. are right. And if our action was wrong, then Martin Luther's was wrong and we should all still be in the Roman Catholic Church. But perhaps you will not concur in the statement that the two exoduses are exactly parallel. Well, why was it that Luther left the Church of Rome?

First of all, it was not because there were evils in the church. He did not leave the church as soon as he discovered that the doctrine of purgatory was contrary to the Scriptures, nor when he became convinced that the acceptance of indulgences by the priests was an iniquitous procedure. Luther did not think, nor do we, that there could be a perfect church on this earth, since every one of its members has the corruption of sin within, but he remained in the church for some time, trying to bring about reform. Obviously, he did not leave because of sin in the church. But he left because a new factor suddenly entered: *The highest authority in the church ordered him to support that sin.* From this order there was absolutely no appeal within the church. To reverse his teachings would have been to proclaim something which he knew to be contrary to the Word of God. To keep silent would have been to cooperate with

the bull. He saw immediately that each alternative was equally sinful. He was thus brought face to face with the same question which was thrown up to the early Christian martyrs—should they bow down before men or before God? To do the former was sin, and Christians must hate and flee from evil in all its insidious forms. So Martin Luther had to leave the church.

## Unbelief in the Ministry

But where, you ask, is the parallel between Luther's predicament in the Roman Catholic Church, and the situation of Christians today in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.? First, the parallel lies in this—that Christians should not leave the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. just because there is unbelief in it.

In the recent history of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. there is a document known as "The Auburn Affirmation". Its declarations were approved by over 13 per cent. of the ministers in the church. (While a few less than this appear in the printed list of signers, the secretary for the group has said that enough others sent in their names after it had gone to press, to put it over the 13 per cent. mark.) What does this mean? It means that when this document was signed, over 13 per cent. of the ministers in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. believed that the doctrines of the inerrancy of the Word of God, the virgin birth of Christ, His miracles, His substitutionary death to satisfy divine justice for sinners, and His bodily resurrection from the dead, are not necessarily to be believed by the ordained ministers of the church. As the Affirmation puts it, these doctrines are not to be elevated "to the position of tests for ordination or for good standing in our church." Three times in this iniquitous document these doctrines, which lie at the very heart and core of Christianity, are said to be only "theories". The doctrine of the in-

fallibility of Scripture is singled out for particular attack, and must be regarded by the Affirmationists as a very dangerous doctrine for they say that it "impairs their [the Scriptures'] supreme authority for faith and life." Are these things not blatant unbelief? Yet this is not the reason why Christians should separate themselves from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

### Unbelief in the Boards

In addition to this unbelief among the rank and file of the ministers, all three of the boards of that denomination are permeated with this same leaven. For example, two of the members of the Board of Foreign Missions, three of the members of the Board of Christian Education, and nine of those of the Board of National Missions are signers of the Auburn Affirmation. What effect, you may ask, does this have on the testimony and teaching of the church? Just this: Unbelief is readily supported by those boards. To use an example in connection with the Board of Foreign Missions, we quote from *The Chinese Recorder* the words of the president of a Chinese university (Yenching) supported by the board. "Jesus," he says, "advocated the abolition of the system of private property and adoption of the public possession of all things." From the succeeding context it would seem that Dr. Wu includes the family in this scheme of things, for he says that "Jesus was not in favor of the family system." Such immoral teaching on the foreign mission field is supported by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. At least, it was before the present war in China. And if that work is not going on now it is not because the church desired it ended, but solely because God took it out of their hands in spite of their desires. But even this is not the reason why Christians should sever their connections with the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

### Unbelief in the Seminaries

Unbelief has further raised its ugly head in every seminary in the denomination. Nay, I should say that unbelief has climbed up bodily, distorted torso and gnarled limbs in full view, standing on top of the ruins of Christian institutions. For of the 11 seminaries within the denomination there has been *not one* orthodox institution

since Princeton, the last citadel of orthodoxy, fell in 1929. All but two of these seminaries have at least one Auburn Affirmationist on either the board of trustees or the faculty. And it is from these seminaries that the men will come who are to preach in the pulpits of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in the years ahead. A short time ago a survey of the beliefs of 200 students in the seminaries of five denominations was made. Among other things discovered in this survey was that, of this representative group, 91 per cent. did not believe in the infallibility of the Scriptures. And there is not one seminary in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. which is trying to stem this tide of infidelity. Rather, those seminaries are sending, and will continue to send out, men of the very same stripe to preach in the pulpits and on the mission fields of the world. Nor yet is this why Christians should separate from that denomination.

### Unbelief in the Assemblies

Finally, we mention very briefly the unbelief manifested in the general assemblies of the church. The assembly supports, to the tune of some thousands of dollars a year, the organization known as The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. To show what kind of an organization this is we just mention the fact that the Rev. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick is one of its guiding lights. One of the numerous sermons written by this well-known Modernist bears the title, "The Peril of Worshipping Jesus". That is the kind of thing the Federal Council advocates. And the General Assembly supports it. Then also, the chairman of the assembly's Permanent Judicial Commission which tried the late Dr. J. Gresham Machen was a signer of the Auburn Affirmation. In other words, those who sit in judgment in the courts of the church are the unbelievers. Although the last General Assembly did not choose an Auburn Affirmationist for moderator, it chose a man who showed his approval of all that that document stands for by appointing a signer of it as his vice-moderator. Nor is even this why Christians should depart from the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

### Coöperation With Sin

If, then, iniquity in such prominent and frequent instances does not con-

stitute warrant and compulsion to leave the church, is there anything that does? If unbelief in the church is not cause for separation, why do we say that Christians should leave it? Simply *because everyone in the Church is now inescapably yoked with that unbelief*. As long as Martin Luther was not compelled to support the imperfections of the Roman Catholic Church he could remain in it and seek to bring about its reform. But when he was forced to coöperate, or at least be silent, then he had to renounce its jurisdiction. And that is just exactly the situation in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. today. There is no possible way for you to belong to that church and avoid either the active promotion of this unbelief of which we have just spoken or, at the least, silent coöperation with it! Of course it goes almost without saying that either to promote sin actively, or silently to coöperate with it, is equally sin. If two men are robbing a jewelry store the man who stands outside watching is just as guilty as the one who opens the safe. To our sorrow every member of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is in one of these two positions. Either he himself is preaching a false gospel or he is aiding others in it. We are conscious of the fact that many do not realize this. But that is just the reason for this article.

So let us examine the facts and discover how every member, even if a true believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, and every minister, even if a true minister of the gospel, are all inextricably bound up with the whole system of unbelief which is running rampant in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. How are those members and ministers in the same position in which the Pope's deliverance placed Martin Luther? And when were they placed in that position?

In the year 1934 there came a mandate (a bull) from the General Assembly saying that no matter what the boards of the church teach, monetary contributions to them (Foreign Missions, National Missions, and Christian Education) were, under the constitution, *as obligatory upon its members as partaking of the Lord's Supper*. Incidentally, Christ instituted the Lord's Supper, and now *the church* institutes "Giving to the Boards." The latter is as obligatory, says the General Assembly, as the former. Dr. Machen, and others with him, knew

that this meant contributing to unbelieving enterprises, such as, for example, the aforementioned Federal Council of Churches. So they protested against that action of the General Assembly which tried to force them to support such blasphemies as the "Peril of Worshipping Jesus" and the Communistic immorality of Dr. Wu. And in June of 1936, because of this protest, they were "deposed" from the gospel ministry. The highest and final authority in the church thus gave its stamp of approval to the 1934 mandate. The General Assembly, sitting in its judicial rather than its administrative capacity, in the name of Jesus Christ adopted the recommendation of the Permanent Judicial Commission "deposing" them because they sent missionaries to preach the crucified and risen Christ in foreign lands through an agency other than the heresy-riddled official Board of Foreign Missions. The fact that the chairman of the Permanent Judicial Commission was a signer of the Auburn Affirmation is just another evidence of how firmly unbelief was seated in the saddle.

To show the significance of this action we quote a statement of one who has become strangely and tragically silent since the climax of the issue began to approach. In the Syracuse (N. Y.) *Post-Standard* for June 3, 1936, immediately after Dr. Machen and the others had been deposed, the Rev. Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney is quoted as saying, "The suspension of the Rev. J. Gresham Machen from the ministry is the saddest tragedy which has befallen the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in half a century. Other men of distinction, notably in the Briggs controversy in the 90's, have been put out of the church, or left it of their own accord, because they were charged with unbelief. But now the unthinkable thing has happened. A man known throughout the Christian world as a defender of the Christian faith has been suspended from the ministry. That this courageous soul, this distinguished scholar and follower of the Lord Jesus Christ should be suspended is the more appalling when we consider some of those who are permitted to remain in the church. . . ." Do you see the iniquity of the General Assembly?

### Why Membership Is Sin

But that was not all. At the same

time that this decision was rendered the Rev. John J. DeWaard of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin, was dismissed from his church because he refused to promise support of the unbelief in the boards. And the late Rev. Arthur F. Perkins, of Merrill, Wisconsin, was suspended from the ministry for the terrible offense (in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.) of establishing an evangelical young people's Bible conference! These decisions which condemned these men for preaching the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ were delivered "in the name of and by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ." It is blasphemy to use the name of Christ to condemn His own gospel.

Just as there was for Luther no appeal from the Pope's mandate because he was the highest judicial authority in the church, so there is no appeal from these decisions because in Presbyterian polity the General Assembly, sitting as a court of Jesus Christ, is the highest judicial authority. Now if it were possible for members of the church to appeal, your name could be recorded as opposed to the decisions, and you would not have part in the iniquity. But since you cannot appeal, your name, *just because it is on the rolls of that church, is recorded as sanctioning those blasphemous actions. The church has thus caused you to sin.* That is a mark of an apostate church. And as long as both the decisions and your name remain on the books of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. they are inseparably yoked together. To break the yoke, one of the two must be eliminated.

Then, too, consider these cases in which the denomination is suing in court before unbelievers (cf. I Cor. 6:1-8). Did you know that each of these cases is filed "in the name of all the ministers and members" of the church? Many people say that it is a "shameful thing" to take a church building away from a group of Christians. But do you not see, from the phraseology of the complaint quoted above, that every member, *including those who think it a "shameful thing"*, has a part in these actions? Thus, you see, mere membership in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. forces participation in sin. God says, "Come out from among them and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing" (II Cor. 6:17).

### Sinful Gifts

We have just seen how every member of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is involved in the iniquities of the General Assembly. We come now to the boards of the church, to see how each member of the church is inescapably supporting the unbelief which is taught by them. Let us take, just as an example of all the other unbelief supported by the boards, the Communistic and immoral teaching of the President of Yenching University which we mentioned above. You, member of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., are supporting that!

You are supporting it, in the first place, if you give your benevolence money to the church without designating it away from that outlet, for your money will go to a general fund, from which undesignated money may be drawn and used by the board as it sees fit. "Well," you say, "I do designate my money to a sound missionary." That is fine. But even here *you are still supporting the immoral teaching of Yenching*, for when you designate one dollar to your Mr. Sound Missionary you release from the general fund one dollar to support Yenching which would otherwise have had to be used to support your sound man. If I have a foreign missions agency with two missionaries on the field, one white and one black, and \$1000 in the bank for them, I can use \$500 for each. But if you give me \$1000 designated to Mr. White I can then send the entire \$1000 in the bank to Mr. Black, instead of only \$500. So you say, "Yes, I can see that by designating I support not only my sound missionary but also unbelieving work, and that is sin, but suppose I withhold all money from the church. What then?" Just this: by your very membership in the church you testify to the world that you believe that the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is orthodox, and that testimony may lead others to become members. You will thus have led them to sin. And causing them to stumble is itself sin.

As a last resort, to which those flee who would like to remain in the church, is the position taken by some ministers. It is the position of non-attendance at the meetings of their presbytery. They think that by this means they have no part in the sin of the church. They think that by restricting their ecclesiastical operations to their own "First Presbyterian

Church" they have jumped out of their skin, as it were, and do not have any connection with the denomination from which their congregation has derived its Presbyterian name. But I am afraid that such attempted legerdemain is worse than futile. Unfortunately, rather than escaping the first sin, the one who follows this method *becomes involved in an additional one.*

In the first place, his absence from the presbytery means that he is not fulfilling his duties as a presbyter and is letting unbelief run wild in the church without raising a finger to halt that desecration of the temple. And in the second place the very fact that his name appears on the roll of the church is cooperation with its iniquity. Let us illustrate. The Presbyterian Church of America has ten missionaries in the Orient. They are the representatives of that church in the Far East. They are also *my* representatives by virtue of my membership in the denomination which they represent. Now there are missionaries under the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. They represent that church in their respective fields. But they represent that church not in some abstract sense, but as it is made up of its various component parts—its members. So they are the representatives of each member. Indeed, many of these representatives are good, true missionaries. *But some are bad, false missionaries, preaching a false "gospel".* Christian, do you dare have a missionary representing you if he preaches against your Saviour? Remember that if he represents the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. he represents you if you are a member of that church.

You see, members of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., you cannot escape entanglement in the unbelief of the denomination. And if you protest, like Luther and Machen, you too will lose your ecclesiastical life. The church is now apostate since, for those who attack unbelief in it, there is a large sign on its door, "NO TRESPASSING — KEEP OUT." The church stands thus not for Christianity, *but for unbelief!* And if you are a member of that church you are, as we have seen above, party to its anti-Christian actions. There is thus but one means left by which you may have separation from its sin, and that is separation from the church.

### Objections Answered

However, in spite of this apparent entanglement in sin, there are some who still think that for one reason or another they should remain in this church which possesses such a rich and wonderful heritage of service for God. In the main, these arguments follow three lines—the first based on reason, and the second and third on Scripture.

There are, first of all, the arguments from expediency. For example, one says, "But why should we leave our fine, big church building with all its conveniences for the preaching and teaching of the Word? Certainly our work would be hampered by leaving." Another cries, "But I am teaching a Sunday school class, and if I leave maybe a Modernist will be made the teacher." And a minister laments, "Oh, how I would like to get out of the church, but we have a big Sunday school, and if we left our building there would be no place to meet." But if you are inescapably involved in sin by remaining in the church you *must* leave, no matter what the cost, for God tells us in Rom. 3:8 that *we must not commit sin that good may come*, for "sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (James 1:15). And, Christians, if your faith is so weak that you cannot trust God to supply your needs here, how can you trust Him to save your immortal soul?

The second objection to leaving the church is perhaps the most ridiculous of the three. It is derived from Jesus' parable of the wheat and the tares recorded in Matt. 13:24-30. There Jesus likens the kingdom of heaven to a man who, having sowed wheat in his field, discovers that weeds have grown up amongst it. The servants ask if they shall gather up the weeds. The master forbids them, "lest while ye gather up the tares ye root up also the wheat with them." So some people say that this means that we should let wheat and tares (believers and unbelievers) grow together in the church and make no attempt to purify it lest by so doing we ruin the wheat.

Now in the case of some of Jesus' parables, our only criterion for interpreting them is the Bible taken as a whole, with no definite, explicit, inspired interpretation given for those specific parables. But in this case God has chosen to give us the explicit interpretation from the very mouth of His Son, the second person of the Trinity, and recorded by the Holy

Spirit, the third person of the Trinity, in Matt. 13:36-43. How some can hold to the above interpretation in the face of Christ's interpretation and still maintain their reputations as Bible teachers I do not know, for in plain language and in no uncertain terms Christ tells us that "the field" in which the wheat and tares must be allowed to grow together is not the church, but it "is the world" (v. 38). So this parable just does not apply at all to the situation at hand.

Finally, the other Scripture to which appeal is made is Rev. 3:2. There we find recorded the portion of John's vision in which God would have the admonition conveyed to the "angel of the church in Sardis" to "be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die." So it is said that this tells us that if a church is dying (like the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.) we must not leave it, but strengthen the remnants of life.

But do not we Christians believe the Bible to be infallible? to contain no contradictions? And does not Paul clearly admonish us not to commit sin even though we think good will come from it? This verse in Revelation cannot, then, mean that we should remain in a church and seek to strengthen it if to do so means to sin in the process. The verse must apply, then, to a church which falls short of forcing its members to sin—a church like the Roman Catholic Church before its apostasy, like the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. before June, 1936; unlike the Roman church after it would have condemned Luther, unlike the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. after it took Dr. Machen's ecclesiastical life. What this verse commands, then, is just exactly what Dr. Machen did: he tried to strengthen the things which remained until to do so meant to sin. But he had to leave the church because Christ purchased him not unto sin, but unto holiness. He had to obey God's command to "come out from among them and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing."

Of every Christian in the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. God asks, "What fellowship hath belief with unbelief?" So little, that he tells you, "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers . . . wherefore, come out from among them and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing."

# Proposed Confessional Revision in The Presbyterian Church in the United States

By the REV. PROFESSOR JOHN MURRAY



Mr. Murray

IN 1935 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (Southern) appointed an "Ad Interim Committee on Proposed Changes in the Confession of Faith and the Catechisms." This committee was continued in 1936 and 1937. The 1937 General Assembly authorized that the report of the committee "be submitted to the Presbyteries with the request that they consider the same at their fall meetings and advise the Ad Interim Committee regarding any desirable changes or additions." This year the committee again presented the result of its work to the General Assembly meeting at Meridian, Mississippi, in May. The General Assembly gave its approval to certain sections of the report and ordered them sent down to the presbyteries for their advice and consent. If three-fourths of the presbyteries approve of these proposed changes then they may be enacted into law by the next General Assembly.

The changes approved by the 1938 General Assembly affect the following chapters and paragraphs in the Confession of Faith: Chap. I, para. 8; Chap. III, paras. 3, 4, 5, and 7; Chap. V, para. 6; Chap. VI, paras. 2 and 4; Chap. X, paras. 3 and 4; Chap. XXI, para. 4; Chap. XXII, para. 7; Chap. XXIV, para. 3; Chap. XXV, paras. 2, 5 and 6; Chap. XXIX, paras. 2 and 8. The changes approved in the Larger Catechism affect Questions 13, 25 and 156, with the addition of a new question, relating to the duty of the visible church, to be called Question 63. The General Assembly also approved certain additions to the Shorter Catechism. These additions affect Question 88 and also include two new questions, relating to the nature and duty of the visible church, to be called Questions 89 and 90.

On examination it will be seen that not all of these proposed changes are of equal importance. From the theological standpoint some of them are unobjectionable. From the literary

standpoint these same changes may or may not be regarded as improvements according to the taste of each individual. But it will also be seen that some of these changes have serious theological implications. That the commissioners to the 78th General Assembly regarded them as such appears from the fact that rather heated debate and division were provoked by the committee's report.

In this article we shall confine our attention to the proposed omissions and revisions in Chapter III of the Confession of Faith and the revision of Q. 13 of the Larger Catechism. It is proposed that paragraphs 3 and 4 of Chapter III be omitted, and that paragraphs 5 and 7 along with Q. 13 of the Larger Catechism be revised.

The proposed revision of paragraph 5 is minor. It simply substitutes the phrase "free grace and love alone" for the phrase "mere free grace and love." We are disposed to think that the original phrase serves more adequately and precisely to express the thought intended. But we may allow that, at least for the present, to pass.

To the proposed omission of paragraphs 3 and 4 of Chapter III and to the revision of paragraph 7 and Question 13 of the Larger Catechism we find ourselves under the necessity of expressing emphatic opposition.

## The Unity of Chapter III

First of all the omission of paragraphs 3 and 4 destroys the grand unity and comprehensiveness, logical coherence and development, of what is probably an unexcelled creedal formulation of the doctrine of the divine decree. It needs but a little examination to show this.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 deal with God's eternal decree viewed all-inclusively, that is to say, as it bears upon all that comes to pass in God's works of *creation* and *providence*. Paragraphs 3 and 4 deal with the application of this eternal decree as it comes to bear upon the destinies of rational creatures—*men* and *angels*. Paragraphs 5 to 8 deal with the divine decree as it comes to bear upon the destinies of

*men*. It is apparent that there is progressive specification in the statement of the doctrine. Within the last division—the decree as it respects *men*—paragraph 5 deals with election to everlasting life, paragraph 6 with the means used by God for the realization of His electing purpose, paragraph 7 with the decree of reprobation, namely, with those not elected to life, paragraph 8 with the proper use of the doctrine of predestination.

The most cursory study, then, shows that the omission of paragraphs 3 and 4 mutilates, to say the least, what is a full and consistently coherent statement of the whole doctrine. Without paragraphs 3 and 4 paragraph 5 reads with an abruptness that is hardly worthy of our Presbyterian passion for fullness and clearness.

## Theological Implications

But secondly, there is a much more potent series of objections. This omission impairs the teaching of the Confession and, therefore, the witness of the church to the basically important subject of predestination and foreordination.

(a) It eliminates from the Confession all reference to the predestination to life and foreordination to death of angels. This is not mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2 and, of course, is not in the least implied in paragraphs 5 to 8. Is it therefore, even on this ground, correct to say as Professor J. B. Green avers that "they add nothing important to knowledge, contribute nothing usable to the materials of preaching."<sup>1</sup> Surely not!

<sup>1</sup> *The Presbyterian of the South*, June 15th, 1938, p. 13. Throughout this article we shall make repeated reference to Professor J. B. Green of Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia, and to the article cited above. We do this because Professor Green is a member of the committee, presented the report to the General Assembly, and in the aforementioned article has presented what appears to reflect the sentiment of those favoring these changes. He has written four articles in *The Presbyterian of the South* and in the *Christian Observer* in defense of the proposed changes. The article of June 15th was the first of the series, the others appearing on July 13th, August 10th and September 14th.



(b) It eliminates from this chapter and therefore from the Confession that which has served to throw into unmistakable relief the absolute sovereignty of God in the discrimination He decretively makes between men and also between angels. It is true, as Professor Green affirms, that the omission of these two paragraphs does not exclude from the Confession "the great principle of predestination." No, predestination is woven in such a way into the warp and woof of the Confession that the omission of even several statements of it would not eliminate the principle. But these paragraphs now in question do more than assert the great principle of predestination. In this regard they are not repetitious or superfluous. They assert that the *diverse* destinies of men and of angels are in accordance with a divine decree that has as its end the manifestation of God's glory. The ultimate condemnation of those finally lost is in fulfillment of an absolute, particular, and irreversible decree as is the salvation and preservation of those finally glorified, and all to the praise of the divine glory. In other words, it is the teaching of paragraphs 3 and 4 that has elevated to prominence the real source and ultimate reason for the discrimination among men. They have, no doubt, been offensive to many. But they have been offensive because many are unwilling to allow to the sovereignty of God its unmistakable rights in the discrimination that is truly His. The removal of them is a fatal concession to those whose theology is in its roots Arminian rather than consistently Biblical.

It must not be argued that these sections, as Professor Green appears to suggest, are the product of Supralapsarian influence. The Infralapsarian Calvinist is just as jealous for the truth herein enunciated as is the Supralapsarian. It appears to the present writer a serious misunderstanding of the difference between these two types of Calvinists, and a distortion of it, to insinuate that the Infralapsarian should in the least be inclined to regard paragraphs 3 and 4 as extreme. What Professor Green chooses to call generic Calvinism cannot, without undermining its Calvinism, resile from the doctrine of these two paragraphs.

(c) The omission eliminates from this chapter the express statement of

particular election and reprobation as over against what we may call "class election." The Westminster divines were composing their creed with the Socinian doctrine of election in mind, and they were guarding against that doctrine. In brief, that Socinian doctrine is that the free acts of men are in their nature uncertain and therefore cannot be foreknown as certainly future. The election of God, accordingly, consists simply in His general purpose to save all believers as a class. He does not determine beforehand who will belong to that class, and so the number of the elect is not antecedently and irreversibly established. In other words, this Socinian position did not regard election as terminating upon individuals but simply upon the *class* of believers. In contrast with this position, as well as in contrast with all other views of merely collective election, the Confession asserts particular and personal election and reprobation. Have we any less need today for asserting in the most unambiguous fashion the doctrine of election as predetermining the very particular individuals who are to be saved and their exact number? In view of the historic context in which our creed was drawn and in view of the theological situation in which we find ourselves, can we say with Professor Green that these sections "contain nothing essential to the integrity of the doctrine of predestination"?

### A Basic Distinction

The revisions of paragraph 7 consist in the *omission* of the clause, "whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth," the *substitution* of the words, "in the exercise of his sovereign right" for the words, "for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures," and the *substitution* of the words, "to leave them to the consequences of their sin" for the words, "to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin."

It is rather obvious that the intent of the clauses or phrases as they now appear in the Confession was to assert expressly the absolute sovereignty of God in the exercise of His mercy, the glory of God in the exercise of His sovereign power, and the justice of God in the ordination of the wicked to dishonour and wrath.<sup>2</sup>

The committee and General Assembly in recommending these changes

manifested, we fear, a distressing lack of appreciation for the rather unique skill and precision displayed in the composition of this section. If there is any paragraph in the Confession that formulates in few words, and in words felicitously chosen, a basic theological distinction it is just this one. That distinction is that the ground of the discrimination God makes is His sovereign good pleasure and that alone; the ground of the infliction of penalty in dishonour and wrath is sin and sin alone. That distinction, so basic and important, is magnificently drawn. Why should we interfere with it?

But the direct arguments against the revision from the standpoint of Scriptural language and conception are perhaps even more forceful. The clause, "whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth," is surely an accurate summary and reproduction of Rom. 9:15-18, "For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. . . . Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." If we take umbrage at the summary statement of the Confession, can we consider ourselves as content with, and submissive to, Scripture? We verily think not.

The change from the words, "for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures," to the words, "in the exercise of his sovereign right," and particularly the argument advanced by Professor Green in support of the change, means, to say the least, as Professor W. C. Robinson points out,<sup>3</sup> that the committee, and with it the General Assembly, overlooked the fact that the Westminster Confession at this point reproduces the language of the Apostle Paul in Rom. 9:17, 22: "For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the

<sup>2</sup> It is unnecessary for us to deal separately with the proposed revision of Q. 13 of the Larger Catechism. The revision here is in line with the revisions in Chapter III of the Confession and our objections need not be repeated.

<sup>3</sup> *Christian Observer*, Aug. 31st, 1938, p. 12.



earth." "What if God willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." Professor Green asks, "Would it not be more worthy of God to signalise the exercise of His sovereign right than the exertion of His sovereign power?"<sup>4</sup> Even if we do make full allowance for the context in which this statement of his appears, is it not indulging in something that rather distinctly smacks of irreverence?

### Professor Green's Arguments

In conclusion we shall deal in some more detail with Professor Green's arguments for the omission of paragraphs 3 and 4 and the revision of paragraph 7.

He says that "the Committee proposed the omissions of paragraphs 3 and 4, not because the Committee regarded them as essentially untrue, but because they regarded their inclusion in the Confession as unnecessary and unwise. They are formulations of human logic which might well be omitted." In view of Professor Green's repeated assertion of the importance of the doctrine of predestination we wonder what it can be in these two sections that the committee, and presumably also the assembly, regard as unnecessary and unwise and as a mere formulation of human logic. It cannot with any show of consistency be the first clause of paragraph 3. Can it possibly be paragraph 4, which affirms that the number of the elect and non-elect among both men and angels is unchangeably designed and their number certain and definite? In view of such express Scripture statements as, for example, that of our Lord Himself, "And this is the will of him that sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day," and of the Apostle Paul, "The Lord knoweth them that are his," we wonder how any argument in favor of omission could even have the appearance of plausibility.

We cannot but think that that to which the committee took *particular* exception on the basis of the reasons given is the latter clause of paragraph 3 — "others foreordained to everlasting death." If our surmise is correct, we simply ask: Is this clause

not in the strictest accord with Scripture? Is it not the Apostle Paul by inspiration of the Spirit who says, "What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction" (Rom. 9:22)? And does not Jude tell us that there are certain men "who were before of old ordained to this condemnation"? To consider this clause of the Confession as unnecessary, or unwise, or mere human logic is reasoning that springs from human expediency. It is true that these words in the Confession, as Professor Green says of both sections, "deter or repel some" and "trouble some" and "disturb even some preachers." But are these reasons that may be pitted against what is awfully, yet Scripturally, true? They are reasons only when we make a seeming expediency the norm, when we consult unduly with the likes and dislikes of men rather than with the final and inescapable facts and teaching of Holy Scripture.

Perhaps the most amazing argument or series of arguments for the omission of paragraphs 3 and 4 is the following. "The positive side of the divine decree we preach and pray, but the negative side of it, which is so strongly stated in the sections under discussion, we leave to be inferred. We prefer not to preach what we cannot pray. We never ask God to execute His decree of foreordination of angels and men to everlasting death, nor to visit any with dishonor and wrath for their sins, to the praise of His glorious justice. We are simply silent in our devotions about that aspect of the divine purpose. Is it fitting to emphasise in our creed points of doctrine which we cannot with propriety include in our prayers?"

Why, we may ask, should we leave what Professor Green calls the negative side of the divine decree to be inferred? Is it not part of the whole counsel of God? Even if, for the sake of the argument, we should allow that it is only by inference from Scripture that the doctrine of reprobation is to be established, are we for that reason to exclude it from our creed and from preaching? It is the Confession itself that says truly, "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in scripture, or by

*good and necessary consequence may be deduced from scripture*" (Chap. 1:6, italics ours).

With reference to Professor Green's argument from the content of prayer, surely this is an astounding criterion by which to determine the content of preaching and of confessional formulation. Are we to include in our preaching and in our creed only those elements of truth which provide us with the material of *prayer*?

It would be quite unfair to Professor Green to hold him strictly to the principle he himself applies. But an example will serve to show how impossible and even preposterous is the principle. We include in our preaching and our creed the doctrine that the eternal Son of God became incarnate, that He offered Himself upon the cross a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, that He rose from the dead on the third day and ascended up to heaven. These facts are the cardinals of preaching and of creedal profession. But we do not pray any of these things. This, of course, Professor Green would not deny. Nevertheless it shows that the criterion he seeks to apply would give us a very attenuated creed indeed. The creed that would be constructed out of the content or material of prayer would not be a Christian creed at all.

No, the fact is that this principle on which he argues for the omission of paragraphs 3 and 4 is not in any case the principle by which we determine the contents of our *creed*. The content of our creed is what we believe, and what we believe is not determined by our prayers but by objective revelation. The decree of reprobation Scripture warrants us to believe. We include it therefore in our creed, and we also include the recognition of it in our adoration of Him whose it is. We humbly bow before Him whose justice and truth are revealed in this His holy though awful counsel. Our very prayers indeed are determined by our apprehension of the meaning of this fact. Not only does Professor Green's argument here subvert the principle of creed formation, but also, we fear, does serious prejudice to the nature of prayer.

Furthermore, if Professor Green's argument at this point is a valid one, then it is by strange inconsistency that paragraph 7, even in its revised form, should be included in the Confession. In the form proposed by the

<sup>4</sup> *Presbyterian of the South*, July 13th, 1938, p. 13.

committee and approved by the General Assembly it reads: "The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, and in the exercise of His sovereign right, to pass by, and to leave them to the consequences of their sin; to the praise of His glorious justice." If Professor Green's criterion is the proper one, and on his own premises, should not this be omitted too? For, according to the logic that is used, this cannot enter into our prayers and therefore should not be part of our creed.

Finally Professor Green says: "These sections positively affirm what the Bible leaves, for the most part, to inference. The election of some implies the non-election of the rest. The Bible declares abundantly the love of God for men, but says little about His negative purpose to allow some to perish in their sins. It even says that He is not willing that any should perish. Would it not be well for us to imitate the Scriptures in their emphases and their silences?"

It may be true that the Bible says less about the *decree* of reprobation than of election. But the point is, Professor Green apparently conceding, that it does say something. It says enough for our instruction and faith in the matter. If we are, then, to follow Professor Green's own advice in imitating Scripture, we must not omit it entirely. The Confession in this regard magnificently preserves the statement of the truth and the proper proportion of emphasis. It does not elevate the doctrine in question to a position that does not adequately represent the Scriptural emphasis. It also, as Scripture does, accords much more space to the *decree* of election than it does to the *decree* of reprobation. But to eliminate these sections would be to upset the balance and proportion and thus fail to give a true reproduction or transcript of Scripture teaching. The Confession deals fairly, we believe, with the emphasis of Scripture; the revision manifestly does not.

We trust we have done something to show the unreasonableness and inconsistency of the arguments used to support the plea for revision. Particularly do we hope that we have done something to show that the proposed revision signalizes a distinctly retrograde step in the direction of undermining the witness of the church to

the absolute sovereignty of God in His discriminating decree and thus in the direction of placating the enemies of what is one of the pillars of the Reformed Faith. We hope that the presbyteries of the Presbyterian Church in the United States will by decisive vote avert such a calamity.

### The Princeton That Was

(Concluded from Page 202)

fellows in faith and in witness. And if in the world of theological journalism, or periodicals of the highest order, the *Princeton Review* stood pretty much in a class by itself, this was only in its own way "Athanasius against the world" over again. The ground on which the Reformed churches built their teaching was good, for they rested in the witness of the Apostles, taking their writings at their face value and so accepting the whole canon of the Old and New Testaments as the very Word of God. The Christian church shows herself recreant to her trust when she refuses to stand for the apostolic deposit in the acknowledgment of its heavenly authority and its full integrity. In like manner she is true to her calling when she does not suffer that in her teachers there should be a breath of doubt or hesitation in their acceptance and avowal of the full truth of Holy Scripture. It is only when the foundations are secure that the superstructure is safe. If Caesar's wife must be above suspicion, the tradition of sacred theology in the Reformed church calls for a strenuous and unflinching defense of a scholarship that faces the facts and will not falter in giving to the witness of the Word of God the homage of an unambiguous and undivided submission and acceptance.

A day spent at Princeton 30 years ago in Dr. Warfield's company and in his home stands out in memory. As a mere junior the writer put the question to his host how things stood at Princeton. Referring to the staff he said, "There are 17 of us; and we are all of one mind." The old citadel was standing in its strength. And it was a joy to lovers of the Reformed Faith to find how Warfield from his watchtower was in touch with the fortunes of the battle for the faith on every front over the wide world. What a prince in Israel he was! It was a double pleasure to meet on that occa-

sion the veteran John De Witt. Two finer specimens of the Christian scholar and gentleman one would need to go far to seek and further to find. They represented the highest type of cultured Christian life that the writer has come across on either side of the Atlantic or, for that of it, anywhere beside the Seven Seas.

Of the men who led the exodus of ten years ago, Wilson, at a ripe age has gone home. For his own sake and for his work's sake, the consummate Oriental and Biblical scholar will be loved and honored. A niche in the temple of memory is his; and those who knew him and valued him will prize the remembrance of such a Christian scholar and divine. In the height of his powers Machen has been called to his rest. His greater works speak for themselves and will do so. But his *ultima* shows him in a light that lets one see how the master of a rich scholarship could come down to the level of the ordinary man—the man in the street, as he is called—and make intensely interesting, attractive, and simple, the case for the faith of the gospel. This we have in his *Christian Faith in the Modern World*. And in the same way, in his *Christian View of Man*, he gave an exposition equally interesting, lucid and valuable, of what the Reformed Faith holds in regard to the race to which we belong.

### PUGH INSTALLED AS STATED CLERK IN UNIQUE CEREMONY

**B**EFORE an audience of about 800 persons the Rev. William Barrow Pugh was installed as Stated Clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. on Thursday, October 20th, at the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia.

Dr. Pugh, who succeeds Dr. Lewis S. Mudge, is well known as the author of the notorious "mandate" against members of the Independent Board.

The installation ceremony was conducted by the Rev. Charles W. Welch of Louisville, Ky., moderator of the General Assembly. Dr. Charles R. Erdman of Princeton Seminary presented the charge to Dr. Pugh.

The event marked the first time that a stated clerk has been installed in a service similar to that of the installation of a pastor.

# The Presbyterian Guardian

## EDITORIALS

### Dr. Macleod

IT IS with sincere pleasure that we introduce the Rev. John Macleod, D.D., Principal of the Free Church College, Edinburgh, Scotland, to our readers. His first contribution to THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN appears on another page of this issue under the title, "The Princeton That Was."

The purpose of Dr. Macleod's article is to show that, before its reorganization in 1929, Princeton Theological Seminary stood without equivocation for historic Christianity and Calvinism. He reveals an intimate knowledge of the writings of Hodge, Warfield, Wilson and Machen and demonstrates that the Reformed Faith which those men and their colleagues championed was the glory of the old Princeton.

The title, "The Princeton That Was," plainly indicates that Princeton today is a new and different Princeton. Dr. Macleod says, of the old Princeton, "It had still retained its integrity, and the succession of its tradition was guaranteed by the conservative constitution of the Board of Directors. It was this guarantee of continuance and stability that was deliberately sacrificed by the changes of ten years ago."

It is gratifying indeed to have a distinguished Scottish divine, who is distant from the scene and able to view the situation with a clear perspective, agree with our conviction. It has been our contention that the "Princeton That Was" is no longer in existence but that its tradition is being carried on today by Westminster Theological Seminary.

Dr. Macleod will lecture at Westminster Theological Seminary during April, 1939, on the subject, "Scottish Theology in Relation to Scottish Church History." He will also give the Tenth Anniversary address on May 9, 1939. The public is cordially invited to attend the lectures and the Tenth Anniversary celebration.

—E. H. R.

### Both Ends Against the Middle

THE PRESBYTERIAN, edited by the Rev. Stewart M. Robinson, D.D., continues its vacillating policy of currying favor with both the Modernists and the conservatives of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The issue of September 29, 1938, is a perfect illustration of this fact.

In one part of the magazine there is an impressive comparison of the Auburn Affirmation with the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., in parallel columns. The purpose of this and previous articles, compiled by a layman, on the subject of the Auburn Affirmation and the Presbyterian Standards, is to demonstrate how contrary is the Auburn Affirmation to the doctrines of the church. The implication is that the signers of such a document should not be ministers of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. With this we are in most hearty agreement.

On the other hand, the main article in the same issue of *The Presbyterian* is entitled, "God, Youth and America," written by the Rev. Jesse H. Baird, D.D., president of San Francisco Theological Seminary. *The Presbyterian* comments on this article as follows, "Dr. Baird, of our San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, California, delivered this masterful address on the spiritual history of America at the Area Christian Endeavor Convention in July, where ten Western states were represented." What makes this comment and article so ridiculous and pathetic is the fact that *Dr. Baird is a signer of the Auburn Affirmation*. Could one find a more apt illustration of playing both ends against the middle?

*The Presbyterian* advertises itself as "An Evangelical Weekly" and wishes thereby to convey the impression that it champions orthodoxy within the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The issue of the magazine to which we have referred, as well as most of the issues of the paper, makes the word "evangelical" meaningless. These tactics practically nullify any attempt that might be made to force the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. to adhere to its creed. With such leadership the reform movement within the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is doomed.

—E. H. R.

### A Stated Clerk Is "Installed"

THE ceremony which accompanied the elevation of the Rev. Dr. William B. Pugh to the office of Stated Clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is of deep significance. According to the constitution of the church, the duties of the stated clerk are few in number and carefully defined. They are: to record the transactions of the assembly, to preserve the records, and to grant extracts to those qualified to receive them. Such duties do not seem to us to entitle a man to call himself, as did Dr. Mudge, "the chief executive officer of the church." Dr. Pugh apparently is searching for new worlds to conquer. Not content with following in his predecessor's footsteps and being "the chief executive officer," he is apparently planning to be the spiritual overlord of every minister and member of his denomination. His unconstitutional "installation" in Philadelphia hinted broadly that he was being elevated to the position of a pastor over the entire church. We shall watch with interest to discover what new mandates will issue from his rapidly expanding office.

—T. R. B.

### KOREAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVES SHRINE WORSHIP

THE Korean Presbyterian Church on September 10th completely surrendered to governmental demands for shrine worship. At that time the General Assembly, in the presence of 200 police officers, approved attendance and worship at shrines. Ministers of the church who wished to record their votes in the negative were shocked to discover that no negative vote was called for. No opportunity was given for debate, and no protests were heard. Written protests against the action of the assembly were returned to the senders.

This move of the assembly is seen by many as the end of the evangelical testimony of the denomination. It is impossible to forecast the future of ministers and missionaries who refuse to comply with the action of the assembly.

## A New Service For Guardian Readers

WITH this issue THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN inaugurates a new service for the convenience and assistance of its readers—THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN BOOK SERVICE. This means that readers of the magazine may quickly and easily secure *any book of any publisher* in the United States, simply by sending their orders to the office of THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. Even the parcel post charges will be paid by the magazine, so that all books purchased in this way will cost our readers only the regular retail price quoted by the publishers.

It is our earnest hope that this BOOK SERVICE may prove especially helpful to those who do not live in large cities or near well-stocked book stores. Persons so situated often have great difficulty in securing even current "best sellers," and to purchase less popular religious books without lengthy correspondence is a virtual impossibility.

But even the best equipped and most modern book stores are unable to carry a complete stock of all good books. Their shelves devoted to religious literature are usually filled with the works of leading Modernists and it is rare indeed to find displayed any book that is true to the Bible and the Reformed Faith. So THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN BOOK SERVICE will be useful also to those who live in the metropolitan centers of the nation.

This new service is not confined to religious books. Fiction, biography, travel, essays, poetry, drama, history and children's books may all be purchased through the BOOK SERVICE. No doubt you are planning to send several books to friends at Christmas. All of these may be ordered through THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN and either sent directly to your friends or mailed to you for re-shipment.

From time to time a list of recommended books will be published in THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN. This list will be confined to religious books, since we do not wish to undertake the task of recommending or rejecting books of a secular nature. But all books published in America are available through the BOOK SERVICE.

Our reasons for inaugurating this new feature are two-fold: First, we are convinced that such a service will be welcomed by many who regularly

purchase a number of books each year and who frequently have difficulty in securing them easily and quickly. Secondly, THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, like most denominational journals, is far from self-supporting and must gain revenue in addition to that which is received through subscriptions. We believe that book sales will materially add to our present income. We believe also that many of our readers, realizing that books purchased in this way will cost exactly the same amount as when purchased in their neighborhood store, will gladly send *all* their orders to us and thus help to increase the ministry of the magazine.

In ordering books please send us the correct title and author and, if possible, the name of the publisher. If the price is known, we would greatly appreciate a remittance with the order, to save bookkeeping expense. If the price is not known, we will send a bill which should be paid within ten days.

It is not too early to order your Christmas gift books. Your list should be sent to: THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN BOOK SERVICE, 1505 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

---

### Recommended For Your Library

Louis Berkhof: *The Manual of Reformed Doctrine*, \$1.50.

Lorraine Boettner: *The Inspiration of the Scriptures*, \$1.

John Calvin: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 Vols., \$7 a set.

Abraham Kuyper: *To Be Near Unto God*, \$1.50.

J. Gresham Machen:

*The Christian Faith in the Modern World*, \$2.

*The Christian View of Man*, \$2.50.

*Christianity and Liberalism*, \$1.

*The Origin of Paul's Religion*, \$2.50.

*The Virgin Birth of Christ*, \$2.50.

*What Is Faith?* \$1.25.

Catherine F. Vos: *The Child's Story Bible*, 3 Vols., \$2 each.

B. B. Warfield, *The Plan of Salvation*, \$1.

Edward J. Young, *Study Your Bible*, 75c.

## GIFTS IN PRESBYTERY OF U.S.A. CHURCH SHOW DROP

THE Committee on United Promotion of the Presbytery of Philadelphia of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., under date of October 7th, distributed a significant circular letter to the pastors, sessions, and benevolence treasurers of the presbytery. Enclosed with the letter was a statement of the gifts of the churches to the boards of the denomination and to the city missions of the presbytery. We quote a few significant sentences from the letter and statement, both of which were signed by the Rev. Vincent D. Beery, chairman of the committee.

From the letter:

### NOTICE THESE POINTS, PLEASE!

That *only four churches* out of the 72 have recorded gifts to all the causes in these six months.

That *only 29 churches* have sent gifts for our own local Presbyterian City Mission work.

From the statement:

21 churches have no recorded benevolences to their own Boards and City Missions in these six months.

QUARTERLY REMITTANCES, or monthly remittances, do not seem to be the rule among our churches. In this matter we are behind many sister presbyteries. We wonder how much benevolence money is lying idle in our local church treasuries, while our Boards are compelled to borrow money and pay interest on it to provide running expenses?

---

## STUDENT LEAGUE TO HOLD CONVENTION IN ARKANSAS

THE Fourteenth Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students will be held from February 17 to 19, 1939, at John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Arkansas. The theme of the convention will be "Saved for Service." Prominent evangelical leaders will address the delegates, and students everywhere are invited to attend.

The League has just completed a regional conference of the eastern chapters at Temple University, Philadelphia, on October 21st and 22nd. The theme of this conference was "The Lordship of Christ."

## Christians and Missions

A Mission Study by the REV. FRANKLIN S. DYRNES  
Chairman of The Committee on Foreign Missions

**A**S THE heart beat indicates the life and strength of the body, so the attitude and interest in missions indicates the spiritual life and strength of a church or a believer. Christianity and missions are synonymous and cannot be separated, yet countless numbers of Christians apparently fail to realize this. Others manifest only a half-hearted interest in missions. Sad as this is, yet sadder still is the fact that this indicates a low spiritual ebb. Wherever the Word is faithfully taught and its truths loved, there one will find a natural and genuine enthusiasm for missions. To such, missionary enterprise gives a deep-seated joy and happiness, and reveals the true purpose God has for His children. It naturally arouses in the believer a deeper interest in the Scriptures, leading to a constant study of the Word and causing the believer to grow in the grace and knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ.

### Christians as Ambassadors

The apostle Paul speaks of this in II Cor. 5:18-20, "God hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation . . . now then we are ambassadors for Christ. . . ." An ambassador is one who represents a sovereign in an alien land and has but one purpose, namely, to represent his sovereign and speak only the words given him by his sovereign. He does not seek to please himself nor satisfy his own desires nor express his own thoughts; his entire life centers in the all-important task of truthfully representing his king. This is exactly the position of every believer in this world. We are in the world, but not of it. "We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." As children of God by the new birth, the Sovereign of this universe has given us to be His ambassadors to this world of sin and darkness. We are to represent Him and present His revelation to men everywhere. Christ's last commission to the disciples before His ascension, was "Go ye into *all* the world and preach the gospel to *every* creature." Hence, wherever sinful men are, there a Christian finds an

opportunity and solemn duty to be an ambassador for his sovereign Lord and Master. "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to those who are lost."

### The Need for Missions

The gospel message is needed by all men everywhere. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." In Adam all died because of sin. Countless thousands are dying year after year without God and without hope, for the wages of sin is death—physically and spiritually. The righteous character of God demands that the full penalty for sin be met, yet in His love and grace He has provided a way of escape, a Saviour who took the place of sinful man and suffered and died to satisfy the righteous demands of God's justice. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

The fact, then, that all men by nature are sinners and under the wrath of God (see John 3:36 and II Thess. 1:7-9) should constantly impress upon us the awful and hopeless condition of man. The fact that God has provided a way of escape and only one, and that through the shed blood of Christ for all who believe, should ever stir us to a ceaseless effort to make this message of reconciliation known to all men. The gospel is a universal message and not intended merely for a particular race or part of the world. God has His elect among all people and nations. "Look unto me all ye people from the ends of the earth . . . and be ye saved." Therefore, the great commission is for us to "teach all nations." Christ said before His crucifixion, "And I, if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me." Wherever the gospel is preached the Holy Spirit accompanies the Word to the hearts of unbelievers, convicting of sin and working a work of regeneration in the hearts of those for whom Christ died.

More than anything else the world today needs the gospel. Men and nations have turned their backs on God, and how hopeless and miserable is their condition. God alone is able to right conditions and give peace and satisfaction. Wherever the gospel has

gone and the Word has been honored, there countless blessings have been received. This sin-cursed world has little to offer, but redemption in Christ means everything for time and eternity. Many nations have closed their doors to Christianity. Many false "isms" have arisen and are flourishing. Mormonism alone sends forth each year 5,000 of its young people to propagate its false doctrine. This only proves to us that there is now a greater need than ever before to be interested in true missions. The gospel is still "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." We dare not as Christians be uninterested in missions.

### The Message of Missions

There has been much disputing about this, especially in recent years. The Modernist would argue for a change to meet 20th century needs. An illustration of this is the Modern Missions Movement, which is an outgrowth of the "Laymen's Inquiry" which produced the notorious book, "Re-Thinking Missions." This is easy to understand when one considers that those who are of this mind deny the supernatural in Christianity.

On the other hand, there are those who are truly Christians and dare to believe all that God has revealed in His Word. As such they believe God is "the same yesterday, today and forever." Man is basically the same in this day and age as he has been ever since the Fall. Man, in the Fall, lost all of his original righteousness and has since been totally depraved. Man's problems are all the result of sin and can only be adequately understood and dealt with when considered in the light of Scripture. The gospel of salvation through the shed blood of Christ is the only message which can be of genuine help to man. This message is not, nor has it ever been, popular—not even when preached by Christ and the apostles. Paul says, "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." As true ambassadors for Christ we have no right to question the message entrusted to us; it is for us merely to be faithful in seeing that it is set forth; then we may leave the results with God. God, in Isaiah 51:6, tells us why the message should not be changed, "Lift up your eyes unto the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath: for the heavens shall vanish

away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished."

### Missionary Methods

Christ, in Matt. 9:37, 38, says, "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest." To carry on missions successfully we must look first to God. Missionary work, to be blessed of God, must be Christ-centered and Christ-dependent. Yet God has also given His people a part and responsibility. We need to examine ourselves and to be yielded to God so we may be used of Him in this great task of missions in whatever way He chooses to use us. All can witness to the gospel among those they meet from day to day. All can pray. A. J. Gordon has written, "You can do more than pray when you have prayed, but you cannot do more than pray until you have prayed." Oh, that all Christians might realize the imperativeness of intercessory prayer in missions—whether at home or abroad!

All can give of their means as God has blessed them. The story is told of a Belgian soldier who had lost both his legs in the war. He was asked by a friend if he was not sorry he had fought. His answer was, "No, I wanted to give my life for my country." "But," said the friend, "you lost your legs." "No," said the soldier, "I gave them." Do we count what we give to the Lord's work as lost, or is it a love-gift expressing our gratitude and praise to Him who has given all to us?

Too often Christians and churches fear to take too large a part in missions, lest they suffer want at home. But is this not expressing distrust in God? Has God not given us the commission and will He not care for our needs if we are faithful in heeding His command? I believe many Christians suffer physical and spiritual needs because they have not been honest with God. God desires that we prove Him in all that He has spoken to us in His Word. The work of missions is often hampered because we as Christians are unfaithful in doing our part. A ship was wrecked in a storm. So severe was the storm that the shore crew was hesitant about go-

### The Index

Important demands on space make it necessary to omit the index of Volume 3 from this issue. Publication of the indices will be resumed next month.

ing to the rescue. Finally the captain cried, "Men, don't worry about getting back. Our duty is to get out there." So Christ, our Captain, calls us today. The storm of sin has overwhelmed the human race. It is not for us to worry about our selfish interests, but to thrust forth with the Word of salvation entrusted to us.

### News From the Orient

**A** LETTER from the Rev. R. Heber McIlwaine at Tokyo tells of a splendid opportunity to spread the gospel among wounded Japanese soldiers. He writes, on September 10th:

Our helper was in to see me yesterday, and tells me of the opportunity to distribute 2,000 Bible portions or New Testaments to wounded soldiers in the hospitals. His former and, to some extent, present connections with the Bible Society are a help in this. We are praying that the Word may bear fruit, and that contacts may be made which can be followed up later, and that this may be a means of bringing many to a knowledge of Him who alone can comfort and save. The helper says that theatrical and other secular entertainment is said to leave many of the soldiers more depressed than ever, so permission is being given to distribute these Gospel portions. May God bless His Word, and use these conditions to turn men from a vain world to Him.

Mr. Richard B. Gaffin, in Tsingtao, China, writes of his gratitude for the prayers of members and missionary societies of The Presbyterian Church of America:

We rejoice and give thanks for your prayers and the prayers of all our friends and supporters. When we came to China we asked our friends to pray on the pattern of Paul's request for prayer in II Thess. 3:1-3. We never dreamed when we came what was coming on China, but we see how the Lord has answered and kept us from evil and indeed delivered us from unreasonable and wicked men and, best of all, we have not been hindered, except by circumstances, from preaching the Word.

We are all well and are enjoying the fine weather of this summer resort. The sea bathing is good here; however, the

best weather will come from September to December. The rainy season was shorter than usual this year, and should soon be over.

The Rev. M. C. Frehn writes that his son, David, who was so critically ill a short time ago, is getting stronger and increasing in weight. Pray for the Frehns, the Corays, the Hunts, the Gaffins, Mr. Andrews, and Mr. McIlwaine.

## COMMITTEES ON CHURCH UNION HOLD MEETING IN NEW YORK

**O**N FRIDAY, October 28th, the first steps were taken toward the eventual organic union of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the Protestant Episcopal Church. A meeting of committees of both churches was held at the General Theological Seminary in New York, famed liberal school of the Episcopal Church. Informed sources maintain that the proposed union will be vigorously opposed by all Anglo-Catholics. The idea of union, wistfully proposed by the Episcopal Church, was enthusiastically embraced by the 150th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., meeting in Philadelphia last June.

Attending the conference was a special committee of the Department of Church Coöperation and Union of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the Episcopal Commission on Approaches to Unity. Members of the Presbyterian committee were: Auburn Affirmationist Paul C. Johnston of Rochester, N. Y.; Auburn Affirmationist William P. Merrill of New York City; J. Ross Stevenson of Princeton, N. J.; J. Harry Cotton of Columbus, Ohio; ex-States Clerk Lewis S. Mudge; Stated Clerk William B. Pugh; and Robert E. Speer. Chairman of the Episcopal Commission is the Right Rev. Edward Lambe Parsons, bishop of California. The Rev. Dr. Howard Chandler Robbins, Professor of Pastoral Theology in the General Theological Seminary, is the commission's secretary.

The first meeting of the two commissions was for the purpose of mapping out plans for the future, and will probably be followed by many more conferences. Meanwhile, it is reported that many members of both denominations are viewing the proceedings with a measure of distrust.

## Studies in the Shorter Catechism

By the REV. JOHN H. SKILTON

### LESSON 68

#### The Lord's Supper

QUESTION 96. *What is the Lord's Supper?*

ANSWER. *The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament wherein, by giving and receiving bread and wine, according to Christ's appointment, his death is showed forth; and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of his body and blood, with all his benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.*

QUESTION 97. *What is required to the worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper?*

ANSWER. *It is required of them that would worthily partake of the Lord's Supper, that they examine themselves, of their knowledge to discern the Lord's body, of their faith to feed upon him, of their repentance, love, and new obedience; lest coming unworthily, they eat and drink judgment to themselves.*

IN PREPARING ourselves for a study of the Lord's Supper it would be beneficial for us to examine Matthew 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-24; Luke 22:19, 20; and I Cor. 10:15-17; 11:23-30.

#### The Institution of the Lord's Supper

The Lord's Supper (I Cor. 11:20), otherwise referred to as the cup of blessing (I Cor. 10:16), the Lord's Table (I Cor. 10:21), the communion (I Cor. 10:16), and the breaking of bread (Acts 2:41), was instituted by our Redeemer on the night in which He was betrayed, in association with the Passover (see Matt. 26:26; I Cor. 11:23; 5:7; and consider the purpose of each ordinance).

The divine command is to observe the sacrament in remembrance of Christ till He come (Lk. 22:19; I Cor. 11:24, 26). And the gracious purpose of the sacrament could not be fulfilled if the church of God ceased to observe it before the last day.

#### The Elements

The elements or materials to be

used in the Lord's Supper are those employed by our Saviour at the time of institution. He took bread and the cup, containing the fruit of the vine, elements suggestive of nourishment (Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25). Unleavened bread was used in the passover feast (Ex. 12:18, 19) and was accordingly taken by our Lord in the institution of the sacrament, but all the intended symbolism is retained if we use leavened bread.

#### The Service

In observing the Lord's Supper, the officiating minister, who should be ordained, is to offer prayer, rendering thanks for the gift of Christ and for His atoning death, and blessing or setting apart the elements to their appointed use in the sacrament. No miracle occurs through the blessing, whereby the elements are transformed into something they were not before, but they are merely consecrated to a certain employment. Thus Paul speaks of "the cup of blessing which we bless," the consecrated cup upon which the minister has invoked the divine blessing (I Cor. 10:16; Matt. 26:26-28; I Cor. 11:23-29).

After the prayer, the bread is to be broken (Matt. 26:26, 27; Mark 14:22, 23; Lk. 22:19; I Cor. 11:24). The broken bread symbolizes the body of our Lord broken for us (I Cor. 10:22; 11:24; and see also Acts 2:42; I Cor. 10:16). The bread is to be given to the communicants, received by them with their hands, and eaten. Our Lord said, "Take, eat." He bestows Himself upon His people (Lk. 22:19, 20; John 6:48-58); and they individually receive and make use of that which He provides. They do not initiate spiritual life in themselves; but having been made alive, they believe and receive Christ as their spiritual bread. The eating of one bread by believers symbolizes their union (I Cor. 10:17).

Our Saviour also took the cup, gave it to His disciples, and said, "Drink ye all of it." The cup, like the bread, must be served to all (Matt. 26:27). In receiving of the one cup believers again exhibit their unity and pledge their love, communion,

and willingness to work together for their Saviour (I Cor. 10:16-22).

#### The Purpose of the Lord's Supper

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a *sign*. In it the fact and the significance of the death of our Lord are set forth and memorialized (I Cor. 11:24-26; Matt. 26:28). We manifest in it our participation in Christ crucified, our derivation of benefits from Him, and our union and communion with Him and with one another. It is a *badge* or *mark* of our professing to be Christians, of our heavenly citizenship, and our belief in and loyal submission to Jesus Christ (I Cor. 11:20, 26). In it we offer thanks to God. It is a *seal* or *pledge* of the Redeemer's love and of the certain fulfillment of His promises. It seals to believers the blessings of the new covenant.

The Lord's Supper is also a *means of grace*. When the Holy Spirit, who alone gives efficacy to the sacraments, operates, true believers, partaking of the Lord's Supper, actually receive benefits of the redemption purchased by Christ, are granted increase of faith, and are nourished in the Saviour. As the Catechism expresses it, they are "made partakers of his body and blood, with all his benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace." The bread which we break is a "participation" of the body of Christ and the cup a "participation" of the blood of Christ (I Cor. 10:16; cf. John 6:53). The participation is, of course, not "after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith."

The body of Christ is not present materially, in, with, or under the elements. It is not in any way available to our senses. We do, however, receive our Lord's "body as broken, or given unto death for us, and his blood as shed for the remission of sins." "What is affirmed to be present is not the body and blood of Christ absolutely, but his body as broken, and his blood as shed. It is the sacrifice which he offered that is present and of which the believer partakes. It is present to the mind, not to our bodies. It is perceived and received by faith and not otherwise. . . . By presence is not meant local nearness. . . . The body and blood are present to us when they fill our thoughts, are apprehended by faith as broken and shed for our salvation, and exert upon us their proper effect" (Dr.



Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology* III: XX: 16).

In a spiritual manner Christ as a divine Person is present in the Lord's Supper. He may rightly be said to be present when He "fills the mind, sheds abroad his love in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto us; and not only communicates to us the benefits of his sufferings and death, that is, the remission of our sins and reconciliation with God, but also infuses his life into us" (Dr. Charles Hodge).

We must remember that the eating mentioned in John 6: 53-58 is not that which is to be found exclusively in the Lord's Supper, for in that case the Supper would be essential to salvation and the Scriptures would contradict themselves. To eat Christ is "to receive and appropriate him and his sacrificial work for the life of our souls." It has been expressed, "Eating is believing."

### Worthily Receiving the Sacrament

The Lord's Supper is normally designed solely for baptized believers. Baptism, the initiatory sacrament, is to be administered only once; but the Lord's Supper, which has to do with our spiritual nourishment, a process, is to be received often.

No man is in himself *worthy* to receive the sacrament. No man deserves any of the gracious bestowals of God. But all who do receive the Lord's Supper should prepare themselves that they may partake of it *worthily*, or in a worthy fashion. We should examine ourselves to see whether we possess knowledge to discern the Lord's body, as to whether we can recognize beneath the symbolism of the elements the death of our Lord in our stead (I Cor. 11: 28, 29). We should question ourselves as to whether we have living, active faith whereby we can feed upon Christ (John 6: 50-58, 62-65), genuine repentance (Zech. 12: 10; Acts 2: 38, 46), love to God and man (John 21: 15-17), and new obedience (Matt. 5: 23, 23; Lk. 10: 27; I Cor. 5: 8; 10: 31; 11: 18). Coming with the right preparation and the required spirit, we should expect to grow in grace (Eph. 3: 17-19; Phil. 3: 11-16). See the Larger Catechism, Q. 171.

The ignorant and the scandalous should be kept from the Lord's Table, but those who make a credible profession of faith are to be admitted. On the admission of those lacking the

assurance of hope, see the Larger Catechism, Q. 172.

Believers who may at some time unworthily have partaken of the Lord's Supper did not thereby receive perdition, but exposed themselves to a judgment in some form. To "eat and drink judgment to themselves does not mean that the sin of 'unworthy communicating' is unpardonable, although, like all sin, worthy of endless punishment; but only that he who commits it deserves the punishment due to a grave offense" (Harper). See I Cor. 11: 27-32.

On our duty at the time of reception and afterwards, see the Larger Catechism, Q. 174 and Q. 175.

#### SUBJECTS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. Is it of any importance whether leavened or unleavened bread is employed in the Lord's Supper? Is a wafer such as is used by the Romish Church satisfactory?

2. Who should receive the Lord's Supper? Should the congregation receive only the bread?

3. What is meant by transubstantiation? Develop the Romish conception of the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice and refute from Scripture.

4. How may Christ be said to be present in the Lord's Supper?

5. In what way is the Lord's Supper a *sign*, a *seal*, and a *means of grace*?

6. How do love, joy, sorrow, gratitude, faith, and knowledge enter into our worthily receiving the Lord's Supper? Who are to be admitted and who excluded from the Lord's Supper?

7. What is our duty before, during, and after the Lord's Supper?

8. How may the Lord's Supper be said to be a "commemorative, a confirming, a covenanting, a confessing, and a communing ordinance?"

## LESSON 69

### Prayer

QUESTION 98. *What is prayer?*

ANSWER. *Prayer is an offering up of our desires unto God, for things agreeable to his will, in the name of Christ, with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies.*

### A Means of Grace

**P**RAYER, "the converse of the soul with God," has been established by our God as a means we may employ in receiving grace or blessing from Him, of "His communicating the life-giving and sanctifying influences of the Spirit" to our souls (James 1: 5; Phil. 4: 6, 7; Luke 11: 9-13). It leads us very near unto Him. In the exercise of prayer right attitudes are en-

couraged and right emotions engendered. Fellowship with God, "converse with Him, calls into exercise all gracious affections, reverence, love, gratitude, submission, faith, joy, and devotion. When the soul thus draws near to God, God draws near to it, manifests his glory, sheds abroad his love, and imparts that peace which passes all understanding. Our Lord says, 'If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him' (John 14: 23). In such fellowship, the soul must be holy and must be blessed" (Dr. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, III: XX: 20).

The history of God's Church abounds in testimonies to the fact that the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. The ear of the all-powerful Sovereign is attentive to the voice of His children's supplication. And He imparts benefits through prayer, not only to the *souls* of His people, but has also in response to prayer developed His providences and wrought history-forming events. He has, of course, foreordained all things, but we must remember that He has established means as well as ends. He eternally decreed prayer as a means of imparting grace and effecting glorious purposes. He chose a people for Himself who could, through His grace, ask according to His will and glorify Him in their petitions.

Prayer as the "converse of the soul with God" is in a certain sense constantly being employed by the faithful Christian. It "includes those spiritual exercises, those goings forth of the soul toward God in thought and feeling, which reveal themselves in the forms of reverence, gratitude, sorrow for sin, sense of dependence, and obligation" (Dr. Charles Hodge). But our ideas and emotions require verbal expression. Men *express* prayer to God in secret (Dan. 6: 10; Matt. 6: 6); socially, as in the family (Job 1: 5; Jer. 10: 25; Matt. 18: 19, 20; Acts 1: 14); and publicly, in the church (Isa. 56: 7; Acts 2: 42; I Cor. 14: 14-16). Constancy and regularity are to be sought in our expressed prayers.

Prayer is based on the fact that God is a person, that He has a concern in our affairs, is near to us, and willing to hear us, is able to answer us, and makes use of means in working out His eternal purpose.

### To Whom We Are to Pray

Prayer is to be made only to the living and true God. It is a special part of religious worship and is to be addressed to Him who alone can "search the hearts, hear the requests, pardon the sins, and fulfill the desires of all" (Larger Catechism, Q. 179). Prayers recorded in the Scriptures which provide examples for our praying are made to God absolutely or to persons in the Godhead (Cf. I Tim. 1:12; Rev. 1:5, 6; 5:13; Acts 7:59, 60; II Cor. 12:8, 9; Eph. 1:17; 3:14; I Thess. 3:11).

### For What We Are to Pray

We are to ask God only for such things as He agrees to grant His people, for those things that tend toward His glory. See the Larger Catechism, Q. 185. We may have this confidence "that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us" (I John 5:14). It is well also to bear in mind the statement of James (4:3): "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts."

We are to pray for ourselves (Matt. 6:9-13; Gen. 32:11; Lk. 18:13; Jas. 5:16) and for all other men (I Tim. 2:1, 2; Eph. 1:16, 17; 3:14-17), except for the dead, who cannot be affected by our prayers (Prov. 14:32; Lk. 16:26; Rev. 22:11), and for those who are guilty of the unpardonable sin (Matt. 12:31; I John 5:16). See the Larger Catechism, Q. 183.

But we, "not knowing what to pray for as we ought, the Spirit helpeth our infirmities, by enabling us to understand both for whom, and what, and how prayer is to be made; and by waking and quickening in our hearts (although not in all persons, nor at all times in the same measure) those apprehensions, affections, and graces, which are requisite for the right performance of that duty [Rom. 8:26; Ps. 80:18; 10:17; Zech. 12:10]" (Larger Catechism, Q. 182).

Prayer is a result of the work of grace performed by the Holy Spirit in us. The Holy Spirit Himself has been given to us because of the gracious work of the Lord Jesus Christ (John 15:26; 16:7; Acts 5:31; Tit. 3:5, 6). And our Lord Jesus came to this world fulfilling an eternal purpose of grace (Rom. 8:28-32; Eph. 1:3-6).

From beginning to end of the whole system of truth taught in the Word

of God we are brought to realize our complete dependence upon grace.

Not only should we offer petitions to God and plead with Him in our prayers, but adoration, confession, and thanksgiving should not be neglected.

### How We Are to Pray

We are to pray *reverently*, without undue familiarity, with an "awful apprehension of the majesty of God" (Ps. 33:8; 95:6); *sincerely*, not simply uttering empty words or failing to join in heart with others in social or public prayer, when appearing to do so (Heb. 10:22; Ps. 145:18; 17:1; John 4:24; *in humility* realizing our unworthiness (Ps. 130:3; Lk. 18:13); with *importunity*, since God does not always answer immediately, for our own benefit and His glory (Matt. 15:22; Lk. 18:5-8; 11:5-8; I Thess. 5:17); *submissively* (Matt. 26:39); *in faith* that God is, that He can answer and will answer our prayer if the best end is to be attained by doing so (John 14:13; Matt. 18:19; I John 5:14); with *penitence* (Ps. 51:17), *enlarged hearts* (Ps. 119:32; Is. 60:5; II Cor. 6:11, 13), *understanding* (I Cor. 14:15), *fergency* (Jas. 5:16), *love* (I Tim. 2:8; Matt. 5:23, 24), and permissible *boldness* (Rom. 8:14-17; Gal. 4:7; John 14:13, 14). See the Larger Catechism, Q. 185.

For examples of fitting posture in prayer, see II Chron. 6:13; Mk. 11:25; Lk. 5:8-12; and Gen. 24:26.

### In the Name of Christ

We can approach God in prayer in no other name than that of the only Redeemer, the one Mediator between God and men. Our own sin would forever exclude us from the divine favor and presence. But the Lord Jesus has invited us, His people, to pray. United with Him who continually makes intercession for us, we plead to be heard in His name, for the sake of His perfect righteousness, and ask for our inheritance in Him (John 14:13, 14; 16:23, 24; Eph. 3:12). As to the meaning of prayer "in the name of Christ" the Larger Catechism (Q. 180) says it is "in obedience to his command, and in confidence on his promises, to ask mercy for his sake [John 14:13, 14; Dan. 9:17]: not by bare mentioning of his name [Matt. 7:21-23]; but by drawing our encouragement to pray, and our boldness, strength, and hope of

acceptance in prayer, from Christ and his mediation [Heb. 4:14-16; I John 5:13-15]." See also John 15:16.

#### SUBJECTS FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION

1. How is prayer a means of grace?
2. Does prayer have any effect other than that upon the person who prays?
3. How does the Holy Spirit help us to pray? Is it true that prayer is an "outward means of grace; while the true spirit of prayer is a fruit of grace"?
4. For what should we pray? for whom?
5. What elements enter into prayer?
6. How are we to pray?
7. Should a Christian appear to participate in prayer that does not honor the name of Christ, such as that offered in non-Christian organizations and by enemies of the gospel?
8. What is meant by *private* prayer? *social* prayer? *public* prayer? Is it well to appoint stated times and seasons for prayer?
9. What distinction may be drawn between *direct* and *indirect* answers to prayer? Develop the answer from a study of (1) *direct* answers (Ex. 16:13; Acts 27:24-44; Prov. 21:1; Dan. 4:35; John 14:26; I Cor. 12:4) and (2) *indirect* answers (Gen. 3:19; II Thess. 3:10; John 17:19).

## FALL RALLY OF MACHEN LEAGUE HELD AT NOTTINGHAM, PENNA.

THE Machen League of Philadelphia Presbytery held its fall rally at the Bethany Church, Nottingham, on Saturday, October 1st. The program consisted of an afternoon and an evening meeting and was under the direction of the cabinet of the organization. Over 100 people were present.

At the afternoon service the Rev. John P. Clelland of Wilmington, Delaware, spoke on the subject of "The Victorious Life." The Rev. James W. Price, of Philadelphia, led the singing and also rendered a vocal solo.

The Rev. John P. Galbraith, of Philadelphia, addressed the group at the evening service. He first discussed the Biblical emphasis on doctrine and then spoke on the "Omnipresence and Omniscience of God." Mrs. Robert Strong brought a message in music with her violin, accompanied at the piano by the Rev. Charles G. Schauffele.

Between the meetings a box supper was held, the host church supplying coffee and cocoa.

The date and the place of meeting for the next rally will be announced later.

## News from the Presbyteries

### Philadelphia

**C**ALVARY Church, Willow Grove: The second anniversary of the church was celebrated on Sunday, October 2nd, which was also Rally Day in the Bible School. . . . About 12 members have enrolled for classes in the Calvin Institute of the Bible, and a newly organized high school Christian Endeavor group is enjoying a study in evolutionary fallacies.

*Bethany Church, Nottingham:* Special evangelistic meetings, led by the Rev. Alexander K. Davison of Vineland, N. J., will be held from October 30th to November 6th. At the Sunday evening services the pastor, the Rev. Peter DeRuiter, is preaching on the subject of "Old Testament and New Testament Revivals." . . . Five members attend the Calvin Institute of the Bible on Monday evenings, and each week report what they have learned at the sessions of the school. . . . The church was recently host to the Machen League of the presbytery.

*Covenant Church, Pittsburgh:* Church attendance is now double that of last fall. . . . The adult Bible Class is studying Berkhof's *Manual of Reformed Doctrine*. . . . The women of the church have begun a missionary prayer circle to promote the work of the missionaries of the denomination.

*Kirkwood Church, Kirkwood:* A series of Wednesday cottage prayer meetings has been started, with 43 persons attending a recent meeting. The pastor, the Rev. George W. Marston, is giving a series of studies in the Shorter Catechism. . . . A delegation of the young people attended the Machen League rally at Nottingham and the regional conference of the League of Evangelical Students at Temple University.

*Calvary Church, Germantown:* Recent additions to membership and the regular attendance of visitors at the services have been encouraging. A church location fund has been established, and a committee of the session, assisted by a committee of three ladies of the congregation, is engaged in searching for a more suitable place of worship. The pastor, the Rev. Cary N. Weisiger, will soon baptize a covenant child, Cary N. Weisiger, IV.

*Redeemer Church, Philadelphia:* The attendance has been recently in-

creased by the growing number of visitors from the University of Pennsylvania and from nearby seminaries. Another primary class has been added to the Sunday school, and recent additions to membership have been gratifying. . . . At the last congregational meeting a Board of Deacons was created, and Mr. Howard Gray and Mr. J. Donald Murray were ordained as deacons.

*Gethsemane Church, Philadelphia:* The church reports great blessings following the two weeks of evangelistic services conducted by the Rev. Samuel J. Allen of Carson, North Dakota. A number of children professed acceptance of the Lord as their personal Saviour, and the Christians were aroused to great consecration and service.

*Calvary Church, Middletown:* The Rev. Robert Moody Holmes of Rochester, New York, conducted two weeks of evangelistic services during the latter part of September and early October. In preparation for the meetings about 75 members and friends of the church signed cards promising to pray daily. Four groups were organized which met in daily prayer for the services. As a result, ten persons professed faith in Christ during the course of the meetings. . . . In recent weeks the Calvary Church has been conducting street meetings on Saturday evenings, when the streets of Middletown are well-filled with people. It is estimated that approximately 500 people have heard the gospel at each service. . . . On Sunday, October 9th, the Rev. George W. Marston of Kirkwood began a series of meetings in Carlisle, Penna. A hall was rented and services were held each evening. It is hoped that these evangelistic meetings will be a means of extending the testimony of a small but faithful group which, for some time, has been meeting for worship each week in Carlisle.

*Grace Church, Middletown, Delaware:* From October 16th to 23rd the church conducted a special series of meetings in celebration of the dedication of the new church building. At the morning service on the first Sunday the church was dedicated and at the evening service the Rev. Professor R. B. Kuiper was the guest

preacher. The Rev. Donald C. Graham of Westfield, New Jersey, the Rev. Cary N. Weisiger of Philadelphia, and Dr. Robert Strong of Willow Grove spoke at the week-day services. On Friday, which was known as Delegation Day, the speaker was the Rev. Robert K. Rudolph of the Reformed Episcopal Church. The Rev. Edwin H. Rian of Philadelphia spoke at the evening service on the closing Sunday.

The Rev. Robert L. Atwell of Harrisville is recuperating slowly from a long siege of scarlet fever. Mr. Atwell reports that he is now in good health once more and thanks his many friends for their prayers during his illness.

### California

**B**EVERLY Church, 359 So. Woods Avenue, East Los Angeles: Miss Lyllis Blackie, sister of the pastor, the Rev. Donald K. Blackie, left on October 4th for Kenai, Alaska, where she will engage in visitation and evangelistic work. Miss Blackie will be the missionary of the Beverly Church.

*Covenant Church, Addison and Grove Streets, Berkeley:* The pastor, the Rev. Robert K. Churchill, and the elders of the church are energetically engaged in "Doorstep Preaching." Together they cover new territory for blocks around the church. An attempt is made to reach every home with the gospel, a testimony, or an invitation to church. Each Thursday afternoon the women meet for prayer, remembering especially the families and homes already visited. Afterward, some of the women visit several of the homes previously reached by the pastor or elders. This difficult work is adding numbers to the congregation each week, increasing the spiritual life of the members and injecting a healthy evangelistic tone into the whole church life.

*Santa Ana Church, Santa Ana:* The Rev. E. Lynne Wade, who has temporarily turned over his work at the Westminster Church of Los Angeles to the capable hands of Mr. Russell D. Piper, is beginning a new work among those interested in the Presbyterian Church of America in the promising city of Santa Ana.

### New Jersey

**C**ALVARY Church, Ringoes: The quarterly Fellowship Supper, held on the evening of October 8th, was well attended despite rain. The pastor, the Rev. Bruce Wideman, reports that enthusiasm is high as the fall and winter season begin.

*Grace Church, Westfield:* The second anniversary of the church was celebrated on October 9th. At the morning service seven adult members were received. This means that from the original group of ten the congregation has grown to over forty. At the evening service the pastor, the Rev. Donald C. Graham, announced that this congregation, which had become self-supporting a year ago, now proposed to give the entire offering of one service each month to the mission enterprises of the denomination.

*A Young People's Conference,* under the auspices of the Christian Education Committee of the presbytery, was held at Medford Lakes on September 23rd and 24th. Over 100 young people from New Jersey and about 20 from Philadelphia Presbytery participated in the conference, with every church in the Presbytery of New Jersey represented. The largest delegation (20 young people) came from Grace Church, Westfield.

After a campfire supper the group was addressed by the Rev. James Moore, a minister of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (Southern) in Baltimore, speaking on "God and the Gift of His Son." This was followed by a time of fellowship, praise, and testimony to the grace of God. Throughout the conference the singing was led by Mr. Graham.

Before breakfast on Saturday the Rev. Bruce Wideman led the devotional service, speaking on the 23rd Psalm. At nine o'clock the delegates divided into five groups to discuss problems of young people and the church.

Very practical suggestions and helps on "How to Use the Bible" were given by Dr. Lawrence B. Gilmore in the outdoor chapel. In this beautiful and quiet place, Mrs. Paul Woolley spoke on the faithfulness of God among her people in Russia in the past, and described present conditions among believers there.

Evening vespers were in charge of the Rev. Peter Pascoe in the open air chapel. The closing service in the din-

ing room found about 150 in attendance. The Rev. Edward J. Young brought an inspiring message on "Hiding God's Word in the Heart."

### Ohio

**T**RINITY Church, Cincinnati: A successful Rally Day service was held on October 9th. Fifty-two persons were present, representing six classes. Systematic study and memorizing of the Shorter Catechism was proposed and enthusiastically received by children and parents. . . . The Snell Memorial Young People's Society has re-organized with Mr. Thomas Richards as president. This society has decided to set aside one night a month in which the members will go into the community, two by two, for the purpose of canvass and personal work. The society is also attempting to secure a bus in order to gather up children for the Sunday school of the church. . . . The recent death of Elder Harry A. Worcester was a severe blow to the church, but the members are determined to carry on the work with the same spirit that was always apparent in Mr. Worcester.

*Covenant Church, Indianapolis, Indiana:* Rally Day was held on October 2nd. On the following Sunday the Rev. Robert S. Marsden, general secretary of the mission committees, was the guest preacher. . . . The church choir has begun regular practice and the young people's activities have been resumed. An encouraging number of new visitors have attended recent services, and the members of the church are recognizing the need of personal work in evangelism.

The Rev. Thomas H. Mitchell, who was formerly pastor of the church at Youngstown, has recently accepted a call to a mission field at Indian Trail, North Carolina. Mr. Mitchell has therefore left The Presbyterian Church of America and is now a member of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (Southern).

It is reported that Mrs. J. Lyle Shaw, wife of the pastor of Trinity Chapel, Newport, Kentucky, is now well on the road to eventual recovery from her recent serious illness.

### The Dakotas

**T**HE Presbytery of the Dakotas met at Bridgewater, S. D., on Tuesday, September 27th. Ten ministers and eight elders were present. Most of the delegates had to travel about 400 miles in order to attend. Mr. Calvin Busch and Mr. C. G. TerMaat were received as licentiates from the Presbytery of Philadelphia, and were examined for ordination. Mr. TerMaat was ordained as an evangelist at the evening meeting. He left on the following day to serve the Carson (N. D.) fields in the absence of the Rev. Samuel J. Allen. The church in Lincoln, Nebraska, was received into the presbytery. Mr. Busch was ordained and installed as pastor of the Aurora Presbyterian Church of America, Aurora, Nebraska. At that service the presbytery was represented by Dr. James B. Brown and the Rev. Thomas M. Cooper, ministers from Lincoln, and Elder T. M. Scott of Aurora. Dr. Brown propounded the constitutional questions and gave the charge to the pastor.

On October 2nd the first communion under the ministration of Mr. Busch was celebrated. Two elders—Mr. Albert Hoegh and Mr. Aaron Oswald—were ordained, and six persons were received into the membership of the church. Four of these were by reaffirmation of faith and two were covenant children.

### Baptism

**T**HE second article on Infant Baptism by the Rev. Professor John Murray will appear in the December number. Professor Murray will present the Scriptural basis for the belief in Infant Baptism. If your subscription to The Presbyterian Guardian has expired, be sure to renew it now, in order that you may not miss this valuable discussion.

## NEW CHURCH IN MICHIGAN HOLDS BIBLE CONFERENCE

**T**HE First Annual Bible Conference of the Atonement Presbyterian Church, Decatur, Michigan, was held from October 18th to 21st, under the direction of Mr. Henry Kik. The Rev. John J. DeWaard, pastor of the Calvary Presbyterian Church of Cedar Grove, Wisconsin, was the speaker on the first three days, and on the last day of the conference a number of ministers from the Wisconsin Presbytery of The Presbyterian Church of America took part in the service.

The Atonement Church is the result of the withdrawal of nearly a hundred members from the First Presbyterian Church (of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.). Mr. Kik, formerly student supply of the First Church, was dismissed by the Presbytery of Kalamazoo for his insistence on exposing the official apostasy of the denomination. When the first notice of Mr. Kik's dismissal was received, 88 members of the church petitioned the session to retain him and to allow the congregation to vote upon the matter at a congregational meeting. In the meantime the Presbytery of Kalamazoo forbade Mr. Kik to preach and sent a representative to occupy the pulpit. Presbytery notified the congregation that reasons for Mr. Kik's dismissal would be given at the morning service. *This they failed to do*—so Mr. Kik stood up, stopped the music before the benediction, and took the floor to defend the congregation against the action of its session. As a result the following letter, signed by the members of the session, was received on the following day by each member of the church:

Dear Friends:

The session was informed on Sunday by the Commissioner of Presbytery that they have no power to disclose the reasons, as they expected to do, as to why the session objected to Mr. Kik as a further supply for our church.

The Presbytery alone has power to reveal such reasons.

At the same time the session notified Mr. Kik by letter that he was "not to use the Presbyterian Church for any purpose whatsoever." Thus the fact that Mr. Kik's dismissal was due to his earnest and aggressive exposure of the Modernism of the de-

nomination has been withheld from any publicity.

Mr. Kik, writing to THE PRESBYTERIAN GUARDIAN, has said, "You see, they thought that I would leave town rather than 'spoil' my future by committing ecclesiastical suicide. We Calvinists never do that.

"It may also interest you to know that, after preaching a sermon on 'Dancing to the Tune of a Denominational Whip,' the session handed me an ultimatum that I no longer should preach 'doctrinal, technical theological sermons.' I promptly informed them that my name wasn't 'Charlie McCarthy Kik.'

"Presbytery's reason for my dismissal (seeking my own interests rather than the interests of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.) is *very true!* My interests are truly Presbyterian and Reformed while the interests of the U.S.A. church are Dictatorship and Paganism.

"As we in The Presbyterian Church of America know, one is persecuted when he makes a stand for the Faith. He also realizes that the devil is a personal being!

"Mr. DeWaard will be with us this coming week. Our group, about 40 in number, meets in the Adventist Church and is known as the Atonement Presbyterian Church. Our fellowship is the best I have ever experienced. In the old church, however, they are having a difficult time finding a supply who is sound in the faith."

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

November, 1938

The Princeton That Was .....	201
John Macleod	
Choose Ye This Day! .....	203
John P. Galbraith	
Proposed Confessional Revision in The Presbyterian Church in the United States .....	207
John Murray	
Editorials .....	211
A New Service for Guardian Readers..	212
Christians and Missions .....	213
A Mission Study by Franklin S. Dyrness	
Studies in the Shorter Catechism ....	215
John H. Skilton	
NEWS FROM THE PRESBYTERIES ...	218

## CALVIN INSTITUTE BEGINS FALL TERM OF BIBLE STUDY

**W**ESTMINSTER STANDARDS" was the subject of the address given by the Rev. George W. Marston at the opening exercises of the Calvin Institute of the Bible held in Philadelphia, Monday evening, September 26th. The Scripture, Acts 17:1-12, was read by the Rev. Charles G. Schaufele, and the Rev. John P. Clelland offered the prayer. About 50 attended the service, and 20 enrolled as students of the school.

The Institute is a school for laymen. Its purpose is to train its students in the Scripture, all instruction being in harmony with the system of doctrine contained in the Bible and expounded in the secondary standards of The Presbyterian Church of America: the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Catechisms. It has been repeatedly emphasized that the school is not designed as a substitute for adequate theological seminary training.

The first semester began October 3rd and will close December 20th. Classes are held on Monday and Tuesday evenings. The instructors on Monday evenings are: Mr. Clelland, teaching Bible Doctrine and History of the English Bible; and the Rev. James Price, teaching Hymnology. Tuesday evenings the Rev. John P. Galbraith teaches Genesis, and the Rev. Cary N. Weisiger, Bible History and Principles of Evangelism. During the second semester, from January 16th to April 4th, the following courses will be offered: Monday: Bible Doctrine, Bible Geography, and Church History; Tuesday: Methods of Evangelism, Bible History, and the Gospel of John.

The school offers a four-year course and is open to all who are high school graduates or 16 years of age or older. Those who complete 48 hours of work will receive the diploma of the school. The registration fee is \$1.50 per semester; there is no tuition fee. The classes are being held in the Schaff Building, 1505 Race Street, during the first five weeks; during the remainder of the term they will meet at the Y.M.H.A., Broad and Spruce Streets, Philadelphia. Inquiries should be directed to the Rev. Edward J. Young, 120 Krewson Terrace, Willow Grove,